

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/077,305	02/15/2002	Albert Eugster	GR-47	3405)	
75	90 09/09/2004		EXAM	MINER	
Friedrich Kueffner			DEUBLE, MARK A		
317 Madison A	venue				
Suite 910			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
New York, NY 10173			3651		

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/077,305	EUGSTER ET AL.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Mark A. Deuble	3651				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 23 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appearance (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice it is applicated and the same it	cation. A proper rep ch places the applic	ply to a cation in			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. S	See MPEP			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moterned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate ext the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in			
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>23 August 2004</u>. A 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF 	• •	·	orth in			
2. \square The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or	simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.			
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment			
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does No	OT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to: 6-8			٠			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3 and 5</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8.⊠ The drawing correction filed on 23 August 2004 is	a)⊠ approved or b)□ disapp	proved by the Exam	niner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).					
10. Other:						

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The argument that the member 22 in Boss does not constitute a roller forming a conveying means is not persuasive.

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER **TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600**